PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To: MICHAEL J. MALLIE
BLAKELY , SOKOLOFF , TAYLOR , & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGES CA 90025

RECEIVED PCT NOV 13 2001

REFERRED

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
LOS ANGELES

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

STATUS DB-LA

Date of Mailing (day/month/year)	09 NOV 2001

Applicant's or agent's file reference	REPLY DUE	within TWO months from the above date of mailing
42390.P4740		

International application No.	International filing date (day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)
PCT/US01/01577	16 JANUARY 2001	24 MARCH 2000

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
IPC(7): G06F 9/38, 9/50 , 12/08 and US Cl.: 709/107, 108; 712/228

Applicant
INTEL CORPORATION

1. This written opinion is the _first_ (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

   I   [X] Basis of the opinion

   II [ ] Priority

   III [ ] Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability

   IV [ ] Lack of unity of invention

   V   [X] Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

   VI [ ] Certain documents cited

   VII [X] Certain defects in the international application

   VIII[ ] Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

   When? See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension., see Rule 66.2(d).~~

   How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

   Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
   For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 *bis*.
   For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

   If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 24 JULY 2002

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US	Authorized officer
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Box PCT Washington, D.C. 20231	LARRY DONAGHUE
Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Telephone No. (703) 305-9675

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet) (July 1998)★

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application: *

- [X] the international application as originally filed
- [X] the description:
  - pages _____1-25_____ , as originally filed
  - pages _____NONE_____ , filed with the demand
  - pages _____NONE_____ , filed with the letter of _____

- [X] the claims:
  - pages _____26-33_____ , as originally filed
  - pages _____NONE_____ , as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
  - pages _____NONE_____ , filed with the demand
  - pages _____NONE_____ , filed with the letter of _____

- [X] the drawings:
  - pages _____1-15_____ , as originally filed
  - pages _____NONE_____ , filed with the demand
  - pages _____NONE_____ , filed with the letter of _____

- [X] the sequence listing part of the description:
  - pages _____NONE_____ , as originally filed
  - pages _____NONE_____ , filed with the demand
  - pages _____NONE_____ , filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the **language**, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item. These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- [ ] the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- [ ] the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- [ ] the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/ or 55.3).

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- [ ] contained in the international application in printed form.
- [ ] filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- [ ] furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- [ ] furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- [ ] The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- [ ] The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the writen sequence listing has been furnished.

4. [X] The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- [X] the description, pages_____NONE_____
- [X] the claims, Nos. _____NONE_____
- [X] the drawings, sheets/fig _____NONE_____

5. [ ] This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed".

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (Box I) (July 1998) ★

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	6-11, 16-20, 24-28	YES
	Claims	1-5, 12-15, 21-23, 29-30	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims	6-11, 16-20, 24-28	YES
	Claims	1-5, 12-15, 21-23, 29-30	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims	1-30	YES
	Claims	none	NO

2. citations and explanations

Claims 1-5, 12-15, 21-23 and 29-30 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Sturges et al. (EP 0856797 A1).

Sturges et al. disclosed a dedicating a first portion or way of a memory resource to a first thread and a dedicating second portion or way of a memory resource to a second thread and dynamically sharing a third portion based on resource demands of the first and second thread, and loading the information according to allowable access given the threads (page 2, line 20 - page 7, line 43).

Claims 6-11, 16-20, and 24-28 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(4), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest the application of LRU on the cache partitions being part of a trace cache.

------------------ NEW CITATIONS ------------------

NONE

Supplemental Box
(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Continuation of: Boxes I - VIII   Sheet 10

TIME LIMIT:
      The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.